UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/880,694	06/13/2001	Richard McGrath	G04.007	4297

28062	7590	09/05/2006

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER
WONG, LESLIE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/880,694	MCGRATH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie Wong	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 June 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *06/13/2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 15 June

2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Weissman et al. ("Weissman") in view of **Thompson et al.** ("Thompson") (US 6668253

B1).

Regarding claim 1, **Weissman** teaches a method of aggregating and maintaining

data in a system having at least a first and a second platform generating data,

comprising:

a).   receiving initial data from said first (i.e., source system) and said second

platforms (i.e., staging table), wherein said first platform and said second platform are

different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first

and second platform (i.e., the system automatically *converts the data from the sources*

(i.e., one format) into forms that are readily usable in the datamart (i.e.., another format)

(col. 5, lines 25-37; col. 6, lines 54-56) (col. 8, lines 49-52; col. 11, lines 11-21; Fig.1,

element 110).

b).   generating, using a computer, a staging table to store said initial data (col.

8, lines 49-57; col. 10, lines 46-52; Fig. 1, element 130); and

c).   associating standardized data with said initial data using said computer

(col. 9, lines 3-12; col. 11, lines 18-21).

Weissman does not explicitly teach track changes, additions, and rejections of

said initial data.

Thompson, however, teaches a staging table that track changes, additions, and

rejections of said initial data as once the data has been loaded (i.e., add data) into the

staging tables, a second phase of validations and cleansing is performed. At any time

during the transformation and cleansing process an error occurs, the row of data with

the error is written to an error table along with an error message describing the reason

for rejection. The Data Warehouse can be refreshed on a regular basis. However,

most require a massive conversion where data is cleansed and transformed, followed

by periodic updates of data modified in the operational source systems. Theses

incremental changes must also be cleansed and transformed prior to updating the Data

Warehouse (col. 21, lines 16-30; col. 21, lines 59-66 and Fig. 9 and Fig. 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to combine the teachings of the cited references because

Thompson's teaching would have allowed **Weissman's** to properly represent the

business at hand and thus produce accurate results based on the queries used to

analyzed the business environment as suggested by **Thompson** at col. 21, lines 12-16.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, **Weissman** further teaches associating includes

generating a cross-reference table correlating said standardized data with initial data

from said first platform and correlating said standardized data with said initial data form

said second platform (col. 16, line 59 – col. 17, line 2; col. 8, line 28 – col. 9, line 40).

Regarding claim 3, **Weissman** further teaches receiving updated data from said

first and said second platforms (col. 20, lines 44-46).

Regarding claim 4, **Weissman** further teaches comparing said updated data with data in said staging table (col. 20, lines 44-46; col. 20 lines 8-26).

Regarding claims 5 and 7, **Weissman** further teaches determining if said updated data includes new data (col. 8, line 28 – col. 9, line 40; col. 20, lines 44-46).

Regarding claims 6, 10, and 11 **Weissman** further teaches the steps of:

a).   setting a flag in said staging table (col. 13, lines 24-28);

b).   comparing said updated data with said standardized data (col. 19, lines 8-25);

c).   determining if said standardized data should be updated to reflect said updated (col. 13, line 25 – col. 14, line 5; col. 19, lines 8-25)

Regarding claim 12, **Weissman** further teaches notifying said platform that said updated data has been rejected (col. 10-13).

Claims 13-20 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-12.

Response to Argument

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 15 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Weissman staging table is not both a "platform" and "a staging table" within the meaning of the claimed method or Weissman disclosure. In fact, to interpret the Weissman staging table as a "platform" would be contrary to the clear disclosure and intent of Weissman.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., staging table is not both a "platform" and "a staging table") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant further argues that Weissman does not disclose the claimed first and second platforms wherein the first platform and the second platform are different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first and second platforms. The single platform of Weissman, the source system 110, appear to provide data that is similarly formatted and indexed. According to Weissman, a schema is used to determine the predefined data semantics to which the data from the source systems is converted.

In response to the preceding arguments, Examiner respectfully submits that Weissman teaches a method for creating and populating a datamart. A datamart transforms the raw data from the Online Transaction processing (OLAP) databases (col. 1, lines 61-63). Focusing on the datamart creation, the system allows a consultant to

build a datamart from a schema definition and a definition of the sources of the data.

Depending on the semantic meaning of the data, as defined by the schema definition,

the system automatically _converts the data from the sources_ (i.e., one format) into forms

that are readily usable in the datamart (i.e.., another format) (col. 5, lines 25-37; col. 6,

lines 54-56). The format and index of the source system has to be different from the

datamart; otherwise, the conversion process to make the data from the source system

usable in the datamart would not be necessary.

As defined by Answer.com the term platform originally dealt with only hardware.

Very often, the term refers to an operating system. For example, the source system of

Weissman executes on a Mainframe environment, whereas the datamart system runs

on the Windowns environment.

Platform

A hardware and/or software architecture. The term originally dealt with only
hardware, and it is still used to refer to a CPU model or computer family. For
example, the x86 PC is the world's largest hardware platform. IBM's iSeries
(AS/400) and Sun's SPARC are also examples of hardware platforms (see
hardware platforms).

Hardware and Software

Very often, the term refers to an operating system, and the hardware is implied. For
example, when an application is said to "run on the Windows platform," it means
that the program has been compiled into the x86 machine language and runs under
Windows. It implies x86 because Windows runs mostly on x86 PCs.

Based on the above, Examiner submits that Weissman teaches the limitation "first and second platforms wherein the first platform and the second platform are different from each other based on the format and index of data associated with the first and second platforms" as claimed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie Wong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4120. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30am - 6:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CHARLES RONES can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Leslie Wong
Primary Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2164

LW
August 29, 2006